

---

Subject: Re: IDL 6.0

Posted by [JD Smith](#) on Mon, 31 Mar 2003 16:23:48 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On Mon, 31 Mar 2003 08:50:45 -0700, Michael A. Miller wrote:

>>>> >> "JD" == JD Smith <jdsmith@as.arizona.edu> writes:

>

>> The problem is the IDL startup time is long enough that  
>> interactive use is stressed much more than batch use. I.e. the  
>> standard response would be that you should string together your  
>> bits of code in an \*IDL\* script/batch-file/\$MAIN\$-level-routine.

>

> IDL starts in about 3 seconds or less on the machine I just timed it on  
> (2 GHz pentiums). The jobs we're regularly running take from 5-500  
> minutes, so start up time is negligible.

>

Yes, but that didn't use to be the case. It might be nice if IDL had a non-command-line mode which skipped all the interface startup and went straight into the interpreter. The basic issue is that IDL doesn't see itself as an equal tool among many, but as \*the\* tool, to which can be tacked on bits and pieces of code from other languages as necessary. Writing an IDL script which drives a perl script is trivial. Writing a perl script which drives an IDL script is less so. For good or for bad, IDL's original authors were probably disillusioned with the "string together various disparate pieces" method of problem solving, and wrote IDL to be a "one-stop-shopping" data language.

JD

---